To: Nina Bell (should the attorneys be cc'ed?)

From: Christine Psyk (cc Lynda Hall, Joelle Gore, attorneys? Bc to the rest of us)

Re: Federal Agencies' Review of Oregon CZARA

Date: July 30, 2014

In accordance with our June 4, 2014, letter, we are providing the following update on our review of comments on our earlier proposed action on Oregon's Coastal Nonpoint Program, as well as the development of responses to those comments. Per our June 4th letter, we will provide further updates at the end of September and at the end of November.

To date, NOAA and EPA have completed the following:

- Posted all comments received, including the state's response, on NOAA's website for public viewing at http://coastalmanagement.noaa.gov/nonpoint/pro_approve.html#Oregon.
- Sent letter dated June 30, 2014, to the Oregon coastal zone program agency heads that NOAA and EPA intend to take final action by January 30, 2015, on the federal agencies' proposed determination that Oregon has failed to submit an approvable coastal nonpoint program.
- Established a process and schedule for reviewing and carefully considering all comments and developing responses to them.
- Categorized all comments received into seven major categories and numerous subcategories, to aid in review.
- Set up five topic teams to lead review and discussion for various aspects of Oregon's program
 and prepare written responses to the comments and update the proposed decision rationales,
 as needed (i.e., new development/onsite sewage disposal systems, forestry-riparian areas,
 forestry-landslides, forestry-roads, forestry-pesticides, agriculture).
- Hold regular meetings for various groups:
 - <u>Topic team</u> (weekly): to discuss public comments, state submission, and potential responses to comments and changes needed to proposed decision rationales.
 - <u>Technical team</u> (weekly): to share progress of topic teams, get feedback from full technical team, t-up specific legal questions or decision points for legal and management teams, respectively, and ensure coordination among topic teams.
 - Managerial team (monthly): to provide programmatic guidance to technical team and weigh in on critical decision points.
 - Legal team (monthly): to provide legal guidance to technical and managerial teams.
- Held initial discussions on the following aspects of Oregon's program in consideration of the public comments received and the state's response (new development, OSDS, forestry-landslides, forestry-pesticides, agriculture, forestry-riparian, forestry-roads).
- Began drafting responses to comments related to general program issues, new development, OSDS, and ???.

Feel free to contact me via email or at 206-553-1906 or Joelle Gore at <u>joelle.gore@noaa.gov</u> or 301-563-1177 with any questions.

ED468JC-000036263 EPA-6822_042021

To: Nina Bell (should the attorneys be cc'ed?)

From: Christine Psyk (cc Lynda Hall, Joelle Gore, attorneys? Bc to the rest of us)

Re: Bimonthly Progress Report on ORFederal Agencies' Review of Oregon CZARA Progress being made toward meeting the January 30, 2015 decision deadline

Date: July 30, 2014

In accordance with our June 4, 2014, letter, we are providing the following update on our review of As NOAA and EPA committed to in our June 4, 2014, letter to the Northwest Environmental Advocates, below is the federal agencies' first bi-monthly report on the progress being made toward meeting the January 30, 2015, date to make a final determination comments on our earlier proposed action on Oregon's Coastal Nonpoint Program, as well as the development of responses to those comments. We look forward to providing you with additional progressPer our June 4th letter, we will provide further updates at the end of by-September 30 and at the end of November 30.

To date, NOAA and EPA have completed the following:

- Posted all comments received, including the state's response, on NOAA's website for public viewing at http://coastalmanagement.noaa.gov/nonpoint/pro_approve.html#Oregon.
- Sent letter <u>dated to Oregon on June 30</u>, 2014, <u>to the Oregon coastal zone program agency heads</u> that NOAA and EPA intend to take final action by January 30, 2015, on the federal agencies' proposed determination that Oregon has failed to submit an approvable coastal nonpoint program.
- Established a process and schedule for reviewing and carefully considering all comments and developing responses to them.
- Categorized all comments received into seven major categories and numerous subcategories, to aid in review.
- Set up five topic teams to lead review and discussion for various aspects of Oregon's program
 and prepare written responses to the comments and update the proposed decision rationales,
 as needed (i.e., new development/onsite sewage disposal systems, forestry-riparian areas,
 forestry-landslides, forestry-roads, forestry-pesticides, agriculture).
- Hold regular meetings for various groups:
 - <u>Topic team</u> (weekly): to discuss public comments, state submission, and potential responses to comments and changes needed to proposed decision rationales.
 - <u>Technical team</u> (weekly): to share progress of topic teams, get feedback from full technical team, t-up specific legal questions or decision points for legal and management teams, respectively, and ensure coordination among topic teams.
 - Managerial team (monthly): to provide programmatic guidance to technical team and weigh in on critical decision points.
 - o Legal team (monthly): to provide legal guidance to technical and managerial teams.
- Held initial discussions on the following aspects of Oregon's program in consideration of the
 public comments received and the state's response (new development, OSDS, forestrylandslides, forestry-pesticides, agriculture, forestry-riparian, forestry-roads).
- Began drafting responses to comments related to general program issues, new development, OSDS, and ????

Comment [AC1]: I defer to others but we could send to attorneys after its sent as an fyi. I think that may have been Kris' suggestion on the letter to OR.

Comment [SJS2R1]: Not to the attorneys. We can forward this to Paul and Allison after the fact. The primary communication here is client-to-client, which the NWEA attorneys were AOK with, esp. in that they are not getting any additional fees

Comment [SJS3]: Same comment and nope.

Comment [AC4]: I suppose if this is an email, date is self evident so may not need. However, may be good to formally reflect in title that this is our July update? Perhaps overkill?

Formatted: Superscript

Ex. 5 - Attorney Client

Comment [SJS6]: These two bullets are not necessary in that they are present tense or forward looking, rather than reporting on progress to date. In addition, to the extent these activities have been interrupted by staff out of the office (e.g., vacations), it may create an impression that is less than candid and expectations that we have been moving at the same pace throughout

Comment [SJS7]: Best to insert a date if we can.

Comment [AC8]: Need to update with most recent status right before we send.

ED468JC-000036263 EPA-6822_042022

Feel free to contact me via email or at 206-553-1906 or Joelle Gore at $\underline{ioelle.gore@noaa.gov}$ or 301-563-1177 with any questions.

ED468JC-000036263 EPA-6822_042023